

Fleet Management and Inventory Control System RFP
Answers to written questions submitted after the bidder's conference
July 1, 2004

From Denise Ayotte of Signum Group

1. What type of hardware box does the current MTS mainframe system reside on?
2. Who is the manufacturer of the existing fuel management system and electronic control devices associated with this RFP?
ACT of Alberta Canada, (no longer in business).
The 6 automated fuel management stations are due to be replaced.
3. Is MaineDOT interested in providing disconnected mobile capabilities to their remote users and/or repair trucks?
Yes
4. Is MaineDOT interested in expanding barcode usage to their mobile repair truck drivers?
Yes
5. What are the probable dates that demonstrations will be scheduled for the selected finalists?
If necessary, September or October 2004.
6. Has a budget already been established for this project? If funding is not adequate to fulfill the requirements herein, how will MaineDOT proceed?
Yes.
Sufficient funding for this RFP is not an issue.
7. A.13 Please explain how users on a shared machine expect to identify themselves.
Through a web based interface that does not require that the OS logon match the web logon.
8. A.19 Explain "set benchmarks".
"Set benchmarks" establishes baselines for exception reporting
9. A.24 Please give more information on how these data reloads happen; what causes the need to reload and how often?

The data "reloads" are interfaces to other systems, required to distribute our data throughout a diverse IT environment. We attempted to document the primary purpose and general timing of each interface to articulate the scope of the issue. For example, vehicle rental rates will be set in the Fleet system described in this RFP, but must be kept up-to-date in our MATS system is where the actual income and usage is and will continue to be recorded daily. This information is then "reloaded" back to the Fleet system.
10. B.33 Changing the identity of a unit seems to violate "best practices" for asset management. What might cause this to happen?

MaineDOT on occasion will change the identity of a unit based on either a functional change in the way the asset is being used or in changed to respond to the way senior management wants information organized. This is not a routine event however, it has come up on occasion and is something we require the proposed system to accommodate.
11. B.38 Is this describing the changing of "parent/child" relationships between assets, or something else? If something else, please explain.

Yes, the changes will be between Parent/Child

Fleet Management and Inventory Control System RFP
Answers to written questions submitted after the bidder's conference
July 1, 2004

12. B.40 Please explain the reason for the record split.

E.g. A truck with attachments originally entered as a single asset, then split into separate assets later. For example the winter configuration of a truck includes, among other things, a snow plow. This attachment is not necessary in the summer and is therefore removed changing the configuration and rental rate of that vehicle.

13. B.43 Please explain further where this information is to be populated and for what purpose.

If the system performs validation of vendor ids against a list or table of known vendors, or supplies vendor name/address based on the vendor ID or vice versa, we want to ensure that we are populating this with the latest valid data in the accounting system.

From Ron Katz of Chevin Fleet Solutions, LLC

1. 40 - "Split one asset record into multiple records." Please define/clarify further.

See previous answer to this question above.

2. 47 - "Current assignment to each of the following: bureau, region, crew number, physical location, PM location. None of these assignments may overwrite the others." - Please define/clarify further what MaineDOT means by "None of these assignments may overwrite the others." Chevin assumes that MaineDOT is looking for a hierarchical asset assignment capability that can only be modified by a select group of system administrators, is this correct?

We need the ability for people with the proper permissions to temporarily re-assign vehicles to different crews within the same region. Crew within the respective Regions are strictly hierarchical (parent/child) but there are exceptions to a general rule, such as PM location.

106 - Work Requests "can be used to modify an existing work order." Please define/clarify the specific objectives here.

Our priority is to make sure that work orders are flexible enough for real-life situations (unlike our current system). If a PM job prints out a work request and there is an existing work order pending in the system for the same vehicle it should be possible to combine them if appropriate. If in the process of performing a PM, an additional problem is detected and repaired that same work order should be able to handle the additional work.

189 - "Ability to set up an approval process within the system for selected monthly bills." Please define/clarify MaineDOT's desired approval process.

MaineDOT requires the ability for management to approve a monthly bill online before it is forwarded to our State accounting system as an accounts receivable (whether in report or electronic transaction form.)

195 - "Support capture of different warranties on different sets of the same part due to different warranties offered at various times by various vendors." This seems to imply that MaineDOT is interested in capturing and managing warranties for a Primary Part Number as well as potentially different warranties for secondary, tertiary, etc. parts captured as alternate parts under the MaineDOT primary part number. Is this correct?

One issue is that we may have the exact same part purchased from different vendors, or even from the same vendor at different times, that have different warranties (1 year, 2 year, limited/unlimited). We need to be able to associate the right warranty with the right parts so that we can better manage warranty work.

Another issue is that one asset, such as a truck, will have warranties to track on several components, such as tires for example.

260 - "Option to pass along charge of an item (+ burden) rather than recalculate the cost of inventory." Is it MaineDOT's intention to allow for Part(s) Markup by specific cost or percentage?

Yes

Fleet Management and Inventory Control System RFP
Answers to written questions submitted after the bidder's conference
July 1, 2004

From Barry Acres of Total Resource Management

1. Para 5.1; Indicates this to be a firm-fixed-price contract, echoed by Appendix G Sample Contract Rider B "Method of Payments and Other Provisions". Are there any State procedures in place that prescribe exactly how periodic payment(s) are to be made?

In general terms, payment is made within 30 days of the acceptance of bill for services actually performed. The period or specific deliverables leading to a periodic payment is usually stated in the contract. For more specific information, please contact the State of Maine Bureau of Purchases.

2. Para 6.2 indicates that "a statement of financial stability" be submitted. What is the format (corporate certification, certified financial statements, etc.)?

Certified financial statements are required. For more specific guidance, please contact the State of Maine Bureau of Purchases.

3. Para 6.8 presents the requirement to "provide a clear and detailed warranty on any goods or services offered." In what format will such a warranty need to be (corporate certification, performance bond, etc.)?

To discuss State of Maine practices in this area, please contact the State of Maine Bureau of Purchases.

Contract Award

4. Para 8.0 describes how the parties will enter into a contract (firm-fixed-price). Is there a possibility that the State will not have full funding at the time of contract execution? If not, what will be the contractual process?

Funding is not an issue.

5. Section 10.0 Scope of Work Functional Requirements #40...Split one Asset record into Multiple Asset records. Can Maine DOT provide a business case example where splitting one asset into multiple asset records applies?

See response to a related question above.

6. The RFP states that pricing will be done on a concurrent user basis for 85 'power users'. Typically there are several classes of users 'power users' being one of them. Other types of users typically are called 'casual users' or 'requestors(users simply requesting work)' and 'detached' or 'mobile users'. Is the pricing expected to take into account all of the typical types of users or will the system licensing and access to the system be restricted to only the 85 'power users' mentioned in the RFP? Licensing also can be done based on the volume or number of assets expected to be managed by the system i.e. asset based licensing. Is asset based licensing an option that Maine DOT would consider?

MaineDOT will consider asset based licensing.